

1 KEVIN V. RYAN (CSBN 118321)
United States Attorney

2 MARK L. KROTOSKI (CSBN 138549)
3 Chief, Criminal Division

4 SUSAN KNIGHT (CSBN 209013)
Assistant United States Attorney

5 150 Almaden Blvd., Suite 900
6 San Jose, California 95113
7 Telephone: (408) 535-5056
8 FAX: (408) 535-5066
Susan.Knight@usdoj.gov

9 Attorneys for Plaintiff

10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
11 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
12 SAN JOSE DIVISION
13

14 *E-FILED - 5/25/06*
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

2 Plaintiff,

3 v.

4 PAULINO ROMAN-GUTIERREZ,

5 Defendant.

No. CR 06-00278 RMW

ORDER EXCLUDING TIME
FROM THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT
CALCULATION (18 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(8)(A)
& 3161(h)(8)(B)(iv))

7
8 On May 22, 2006, the parties appeared before the Court for a status appearance. At that
9 appearance, Assistant Federal Public Defender Lara Vinnard informed the Court that she needed
10 time to review discovery and conduct an investigation into the case. Therefore, the parties jointly
11 requested that the case be continued to June 26, 2006. In addition, the parties requested an
12 exclusion of time under the Speedy Trial Act from May 22, 2006 until June 26, 2006. The
13 defendant, through Assistant Federal Public Defender Lara Vinnard, agreed to the exclusion. In
14 addition, the parties stipulated and agreed that an exclusion under Speedy Trial Act was
15 appropriate based on the defendant's need for effective preparation of counsel.

16 SO STIPULATED.

KEVIN V. RYAN
United States Attorney

17 DATED: _____

/s/
18 SUSAN KNIGHT
Assistant United States Attorney

19
20 DATED: _____

/s/
21 LARA S. VINNARD
Assistant Federal Public Defender

22
23 Accordingly, the Court HEREBY ORDERS that the time between May 22, 2006 and
24 June 26, 2006 is excluded under the Speedy Trial Act. The Court finds that the failure to grant
25 the requested continuance would deny the defendant effective preparation of counsel. The Court
26 finds that the ends of justice served by granting the requested continuance outweigh the best
27 interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial and in the prompt disposition of criminal
28 cases. The Court therefore concludes that this exclusion of time should be made under 18 U.S.C.

1 §§ 3161(h)(8)(A) and 3161(h)(8)(B)(iv).

2 IT IS SO ORDERED.

3
4 5/25/06

5 Dated

/s/ Ronald M. Whyte

RONALD M. WHYTE

United States District Judge